

# KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS STEERING COMMITTEE (PESC) MEETING SUMMARY

**MEETING DATE:** January 14, 2014

**NOTE-TAKER/CONTACT:** Renee Scott

**FACILITATOR:** Todd Baldwin/Robin  
Chandler/Kevin Stull/Amanda Ellis

1. Dexter Knight	Jessamine County
2. Travis Hambly	Trigg Co.
3. Stephanie Sullivan	Graves Co.
4. Ronald Chi	Fayette Co.
5. Diane Hatchett	Hancock Co.
6. Steve Carroll	Lee Co.
7. Margaret Crittenden	Murray State University
8. Julie Gargus	Jefferson Co.
9. Kalem Grasham	Garrard Co.
10. Sheri Hamilton	Bullitt Co.
11. Shirley LaFavers	KASA
12. Kelly Sprinkles	Knox County

**Meeting Objective:** Regulation Review of the Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PPGES)

**Agenda Item:** Welcome & Agenda Review (Introduction of Dr. Amanda Ellis)

**Discussion/Action:** ESEA Waiver White Paper and KBE Legislative Agenda provided to PESC.

**Key Questions/Concerns:** None

**Agenda Item:** PPGES Student Growth Goal--Clarification on Student Growth in the PPGES

**Discussion:** State Contribution:

- ASSIST/NGL Goal will become the state contribution
- Process for identifying and developing the goal will not change
  - Principal & Superintendent will continue to identify one of the goals from ASSIST
  - An interim goal will be established for the current school year with the long term goal of reaching the trajectory by 2017
  - Goal(s) will be rated based on the rubric established when the goal is set – rating(s) will be **High/Expected/Low**

Local Contribution:

- Based on school need
- May align with the state goal with deeper or more specific connections
- May target a different school need than one of the ASSIST/NGL trajectories
- Is established in collaboration with the superintendent
- Process will be similar to the ASSIST/NGL Goal
  - Principal & Superintendent will determine an area to target
  - A goal will be established for the current school year
  - Goal(s) will be rated based on the rubric established when the goal is set – rating(s) will be **High/Expected/Low**

At least one of the two goals must address the GAP population

**Key Questions/Concerns: All questions were answered. No concerns.**

**Action:** The PESC agreed that the ASSIST/NGL student growth goal will become the state contribution and at least one of the two student growth goals must address the GAP population.

---

**Agenda Item:** Proposal for Assistant Principal Evaluation

**Discussion:**

Based on the Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System

Assistant Principals will:

- Be evaluated annually by the principal
- Complete Self-Reflection each year
- Complete a Professional Growth Plan each year
- Be rated on the Principal Performance Standards by the principal each year
- Participate in a Mid-Year Review each year
- Inherit the Student Growth Goals of the principal and work with the principal to achieve the goals
- Inherit the Working Conditions Goal(s) of the principal and work the principal to achieve the goal(s) – Districts/principals may opt to allow the assistant principal to develop another WCG if so desired
- Use the same summative model as the PPGES – Professional Practice and Student Growth

Assistant Principals will not:

- Complete Val-Ed

**Key Questions/Concerns: All questions were answered. No concerns.**

**Action:** The PESC agreed to the proposal above for the Assistant Principal evaluation.

**Agenda Item:** Review of Personnel Continuum

The ESEA waiver requires that the PGES system be used to inform personnel decisions.

What does the personnel continuum look like for the administrator that needs to be written into the regulation?

**Group Discussion:**

The PESC was divided into three groups to discuss the following four questions:

- 1) What are the “mays”?
- 2) What are the “shalls”?
- 3) How is data used to inform personnel decisions?
- 4) Discuss the continuum: What is in between retention and dismissal?

**Group 1 developed the table below:**

<b>Exemplary</b>	Principal shall publicly report PGP to SBDM, Staff and BOE  District shall provide resources to support principal PGP	3 year plan reviewed annually	3 year plan reviewed annually
<b>Accomplished</b>	Principal shall publicly report PGP to SBDM, Staff and BOE  District shall provide resources to support principal PGP	3 year plan reviewed annually	3 year plan reviewed annually
<b>Developing</b>	Principal shall publicly report PGP to SBDM, Staff and BOE  District shall provide resources to support principal PGP	3 year plan reviewed annually	3 year plan reviewed annually
<b>Ineffective</b>	Principal shall publicly report PGP to SBDM, Staff and BOE  District shall provide resources to support principal PGP  Corrective Action Plan up to 12 months	Corrective Action Plan up to 12 months	1 year directed Growth Plan
<b>Group 1</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Expected</b>	<b>High</b>

**Group 2 partially completed the following table:**

<b>Exemplary</b>			
<b>Accomplished</b>			
<b>Developing</b>			
<b>Ineffective</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year 1 "Shall" meet with superintendent and revise growth plan (Fall scores)</li> <li>• Corrective Action Plan (Growth + Spring rating)</li> <li>• Year 2 "Shall" meet and discuss lack of growth/CAP (Fall scores)</li> <li>• "Shall" dismiss (Growth + Spring rating)</li> </ul>		
<b>Group 2</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Expected</b>	<b>High</b>

Low Growth is trigger #1  
Ineffective is trigger #2



**The table below summarizes the recommendations from Group 3:**

<b>Exemplary</b>	"May" 1 year self-directed or "May" 1 year directed and 1 year self-directed	Self	Self
<b>Accomplished</b>	"Shall" have a DGD with 2 or more years of Low growth		
<b>Developing</b>	"Shall" 1 year directed  2 <sup>nd</sup> year DGD/CAP	"Shall" 1 year directed	"Shall" 1 year directed
<b>Ineffective</b>	"Shall" 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Corrective Action Plan (Evaluator Directed)  2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Dismissal	"Shall" 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Corrective Action Plan (Evaluator Directed)  2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Dismissal	"Shall" 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Corrective Action Plan (Evaluator Directed)  2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Dismissal
<b>Group 3</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Expected</b>	<b>High</b>



## Summary Information:

### Group 1

- 2 out of the 3 years the same growth rating = whatever the 2 years are
- High, Expected & Low = Expected
- 2 years = most current

### Group 2

- L + L + L = Low
- \_ + L + L = Low
- L + \_ + L = Low
- L + L + E = Expected
- L + L + H = High

### Group 3

- ELL=L
- ELE=E
- ELH=E
- EEL=E
- EEE=E
- EEH=E
- EHL=E
- EHE=E
- EHH=H
- LLL=L
- LLE=
- LLH=
- LEL=L
- LEE=E
- LHL=
- LHE=E
- LHH=E
- HLL=L
- HLE=E
- HLH=E
- HEL=E
- HEE=E
- HEH=H
- HHL=E
- HHE=E
- HHH=H

**Agenda Item:** Review of Personnel Continuum (continued)

The table below is a compilation of the work from Group 1, 2, and 3:

<b>Exemplary</b>	"Shall" have a minimum of a directed growth plan	"Shall" have a minimum of a self-directed growth plan	"Shall" have a minimum of a self-directed growth plan
<b>Accomplished</b>		"Shall" have a minimum of a self-directed growth plan	
<b>Developing</b>	"Shall" have a minimum of a directed growth plan		"Shall" have a minimum of a self-directed growth plan
<b>Ineffective</b>	<b>"Shall" have a minimum of a Corrective Action Plan (Evaluator Directed)</b>		
<b>Recommendation &amp; Consideration</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Expected</b>	<b>High</b>

**Discussion/Key Questions/Concerns:**

What is the time frame for principals to meet goals if they are on a corrective action plan?  
More than one year may be needed for improvement. Within a year, you will see some growth—but test scores may not reflect the level of improvement needed.

What are the "shall" cut points for the principal with respect to growth?

More emphasis should be placed on year 3 (last year of the cycle).

A rolling average is needed with more weight placed on the most recent data.

*"I would not want to label a principal as low if in a three year cycle there is—low-low-high growth."*

What worries me is how we get to accountability?

How do we look at data trends over time?

Should the yellow area be a directed growth plan?

**All questions and concerns will be considered during the development of the regulation.**

**Action:** The PESC agreed to the above color coded personnel continuum.

**Agenda Item:** System Training Requirements/Recommendations

**Discussion:**

Whoever evaluates principals needs to have some training.

Face to face training is preferred—not Lync.

Key elements out of the Teacher-PGES system must be included.

It was suggested that the superintendent and principal go through the training together.

**Key Questions:**

How do you use TELL survey to create the goals?

Can principals pass Teachscape during their University program?

Can you give the Teachscape training in its entirety?

Do principals need ongoing training throughout the year?

How do we roll out the training?

Could training be presented through ISLN or KASS?

Method of who delivers the training—Coops or KLA?

Are we still using TELL and VAL-Ed to establish a working conditions goal?

**Agenda Item:** Regulation Review

**Discussion:**

The PESC recommendations will be incorporated in the regulation. Robin Chandler encouraged everyone to listen to the discussion of the proposed PGES regulation during the February 5<sup>th</sup> KBE meeting.

**Key Questions Concerns:** None

**Action:** The draft regulation will be emailed to the PESC.

**Next Steps:**

**Next meeting date:** TBA

**Wrap-up--Meeting Adjourned at 3:20 p.m.**